

# Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes for the March 10, 2008 Regular Meeting

Chairman: Oliver Smith Vice Chairman: Susan Simpson Secretary: Deb Hoffer

7:00 pm at the Valley Center Community Hall; 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center, CA 92082

A=Absent Ab=Abstain A/=Agenda Item BOS=Board of Supervisors DPLU=Department of Planning and Land Use IAW=In Accordance With N=Nay P=Present SC=Subcommittee TBD=To Be Determined VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group Y=Yes

RECEIVED  
MAR 18 2008  
San Diego County  
DEPT. OF PLANNING & LAND USE

Forwarded to Members:

Approved:

1. Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #: 07:00														
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
SCHWARTZ	SIMPSON		COULOMBE	WASHBURN	ROBERTSON	SMITH	MONTROSS	K. SIMPSON			LAYNE	HOFER	VANKOUGHNETT	SHOEMAKER
P	P		P	P	P	P	P	P			P	P	P	P

Notes:

Quorum Established:

Yes (X)

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Open Forum:

a) John Coulombe – The people of VC can make a difference, just look at the Blackwater Project and the people of Campo forcing them to relocate the project to South Carolina.

4. Announcements & Items of Public Interest:

a) Please sign the voluntary attendance sheet.

b) Hearing date changed to March 21, 2008 for PAA 07-001-2 Fruitvale Rd between Twain Way and High Point Drive (zoning and ordinance compliance issues.)

c) Trails Update – Rich Rudolf: Several changes and additions: Fallbrook to West Lilac. April 9, 2008 6:30 p.m. at the Library. Not all of the trails will be on public right of ways; some will be IODs. Are having discussions with Ricon Indian tribe for connecting trails. Fran DeWilde – representing the VC Vaqueros – supports this trail system. If the tribe does not cooperate, these trails will dead end.

Motion: Move to approve the changes as presented.

SCHWARTZ	SIMPSON		COULOMBE	WASHBURN	ROBERTSON	SMITH	MONTROSS	K. SIMPSON			LAYNE	HOFER	VANKOUGHNETT	SHOEMAKER
Y	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y

Maker/Second: Hoffer/Layne

Carries: 10 – 1 - 0

d) Planning Group boundary with Hidden Meadows – Recommendation Vote

Motion: Move to approve the boundary changes as presented at the Feb PG mgt

SCHWARTZ	SIMPSON		COULOMBE	WASHBURN	ROBERTSON	SMITH	MONTROSS	K. SIMPSON			LAYNE	HOFER	VANKOUGHNETT	SHOEMAKER
Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y

Maker/Second:

Carries: 12 – 0 - 0

e) Valley Center Parks & Rec. Presentation for changes to 9.5 acres adjacent to VC Road, possible recommendation vote.  
Presentation by Eric Jorgenson of the proposed new community hall and recreation center.

Masson and Assoc. are doing the feasibility report. The site is the geographic center of VC. The overall site is 23 acres. The old Comm. Hall was built in 1923. VC population is growing from 15,000 in 2000 to 20,000 in 2010. Proposed is a new community center and a Boys and Girls Club which would have sports and physical fitness facilities. They want a more functional community center with a larger meeting space. They would also like a Senior Center. The Oak trees will be preserved. The driveway will meander to create a campus style design concept. The Comm. Hall and Boys and Girls Club will be in close proximity to share services. The Senior center will be located away to separate services. There will be a playground and a green area and a multiuse trail with an equestrian staging area that will be part of the greater VC trail system. They will hook up to the proposed sewer system. The primary entrance will be from Lilac Road. The buildings will be 2 stories with a barn style façade.

Monstross – The egress seems like it would be crowded if there are several events happening at once. Old Road may be a feasible access as well.

Washburn – is there an easement? No

Layne – Seems like the parking is mostly to the south. A: There is parking to the North as well, it is between the trees.

The drainage area between the Fire Station and the B&G Club needs to be addressed

K. Simpson – Recommends more community input. What about an aquatics center at a later date?

A: the pool was considered but is very expensive to maintain. There are exclusions in this plan that are not part of the budget – how are those going to be paid for? A: Those are not either significant cost items or are not anticipated to happen.

Smith – Where is the Parks and Rec. to be located? A: The second floor will be office space to be leased out.

Hofler – Any plans for expansion in the future? A: not really, no space on the site. Why put the B&G Club next to the fire station and the Senior Center near the Ball fields? A: visibility and ease of drop off of passengers.

Washburn – Why a B&G Club with the decreased population of kids. A: Because the kids deserve a great center.

Coloumbe – How is this to be paid? A: We need a bond measure to get the needed income.

Robertson – How do you get the number of space? A: there is a formula that you follow.

Schwartz – Recommend switch the Senior Center and the B&G Club. And more picnic spaces.

Smith – What would you like from us? A: Would like a subcommittee.

Rich Rudolf – Parks and Rec. needs money to implement this project.

**Motion:** To create a subcommittee to work with Parks and Rec. Members: Dave Montross, Chair, Nancy Layne, Tom Litchfield. Fran DeWilde, Tom Baumgarder,

SCHWARTZ	SIMPSON		COULOMBE	WASHBURN	ROBERTSON	SMITH	MONTROSS	K. SIMPSON			LAYNE	HOFLER	VANKOUGHNETT	SHOEMAKER
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y

Maker/Second: VanKoughnett/Hofler

Carries: 12 – 0 - 0

f)

GP Update Land Use Element draft document, comments and recommendation vote for March 17 comment deadline.

**Discussion & Comments:** Presented by Keith Simpson

**General Plan Update Subcommittee**

**Recommendations for the VCCPG March 10, 2008**

**General Briefing:**

1. General Plan Update Subcommittee (GPU SC) has many members who have experience and knowledgeable about the GPU; VCCPG can have a high level of confidence in the quality of SC work.
2. VCCPG has worked collaboratively with county officials for many years to develop input for Valley Center.

3. Smart Growth principles have guided the process. Smart Growth directs high intensity residential, commercial, and industrial development into small areas or "cores" and the Valley Center Land-Use element reflects Smart Growth insofar as our Village areas have incorporated high intensity development.
4. Proponents of Smart Growth say concentrated areas of development allow transportation infrastructure and limited county services to reach more people. They also say Smart Growth protects rural areas by "down-zoning" outlying areas. But, poorly planned concentrated development can also ruin community character and cause sprawl.
5. In order to maximize benefits and minimize the threats associated with Smart Growth development, the GPU SC believes it is critical for County officials to dedicate sufficient resources to properly plan and implement Smart Growth development.
6. Community Plans and Design Guidelines are legally binding community-specific plans that help communities guide their own unique development, but now County officials say such plans may not be included in the GPU process. Town Center Plans are highly detailed maps of the Village Core, and Village Limit Lines define the boundaries for urban services.
7. Taken together, Community Plans, Design Guidelines, Town Center Plans, and Village Limit Lines, are powerful tools that protect and enhance development communities. Notwithstanding the fact the GPU has been in work for many years, at the present time the County is not committed to any of these planning processes and it has not clearly defined the meaning of the Village Limit Line for Valley Center.
8. Of particular concern to the VCCPG is the fact the BOS has made significant changes to the land-use maps without opportunity for community input or comment.
9. In January 2005, the VCCPG previously acted endorsed the GPU with conditions to improve transportation infrastructure, limit Village density to 14.9, and to provide an appropriate equity mechanism. In recent months, the county process has changed significantly and is now requesting additional PG comments by March 17, 2008 for the Land-Use element of the GPU.
10. Over the last few weeks, the GPU SC has developed two recommendations for the VCCPG. The first recommendation is a motion directed to the BOS expressing "limited" confidence in the GPU process. The second is a list of particular recommendations for DPLU.

#### **Motion 1: Limited Confidence in the GPU process:**

**Whereas** the County of San Diego is developing a General Plan Update previously referred to as "GP2020" and now referred to as the "General Plan Update" (GPU), and

**Whereas** planning officials have, since the start of the GPU, emphasized "Smart Growth" principles to guide the planning process which direct high intensity residential, commercial, and industrial development within Village Limit Lines and into community cores such as the Northern and Southern Villages in the community of Valley Center, and

**Whereas** the Valley Center Planning Group has engaged in a multi-year collaborative effort with DPLU officials that will produce Smart Growth development in Valley Center, including significantly increased residential densities, commercial development, and industrial activity, and

**Whereas** successful Smart Growth development requires individualized Community Plans, Design Guidelines, Village Limit Lines, and Town Center Plans in order to properly implement Smart Growth principles, and

**Whereas** the county has demonstrated commitment to Smart Growth philosophy, but has not demonstrated a corresponding commitment necessary resources to provide Community Plans, Design Guidelines, Town Center Plans, or appropriate equity mechanisms, and

**Whereas** high intensity development without adequate planning protections will jeopardize the community character of Valley Center, and may result in poorly planned sprawl, and

**Whereas** county planning officials have not provided, after many years of work, clear answers to these community concerns, and

**Whereas** the County Board of Supervisors routinely changes the Maps developed by the community and DPLU without sufficient opportunity for community input,

**Therefore be it resolved** the VCCPG hereby notifies the BOS it has limited confidence in the current GPU process, and

**Be it further resolved** the VCCPG requests DPLU incorporate Community Plans, Design Review Guidelines, and a development-restricting definition of Village Limit Line in the General Plan, and

**Be it further resolved** the VCCPG requests DPLU dedicate sufficient planning resources to properly conduct Town Center and Smart Growth planning, and

**Be it further resolved** the Board of Supervisors ensure adequate infrastructure is completed, as defined by the Town Center and Smart Growth planning processes, BEFORE any further development in Valley Center.

Maker/Second: K.Simpson/Hofler

Discussion:

Schwartz: What response do we expect from DPLU? A: Don't know

Coulombe: How does the Comm. Plan and Design Guidelines fit with the current General Plan now? A: The county treats them as legal documents.

Washburn: The Consultant has been brought in to get GPU finished. The statements need to be strong to get their attention. Town Center planning is very important and has been discussed in depth with DPLU and they know what we mean.

Schwartz: What about getting other PG's in on this? A: not enough time. However, there is a meeting on Sat. 9:00 a.m. at DPLU to update them. Other PG's will be there as well.

K. Simpson: We can email the other PG's once we ratify this.

Schwartz: Why limited confidence vs. no confidence? A: The experienced members felt that this is the best way to present this.

Ann Quinley: Very thoughtful and professional meeting.

Jim Quisquis: Perhaps we can structure the wording so that we can state that we have no confidence in the process but not in DPLU.

## **Motion 2: VCCPG Comments on Land-Use Goals and Policies:**

The VCCPG urges the DPLU to incorporate the following recommendations into the GPU:

1. **Residential Density:** Goal LU-1.A states: "Population growth that is accommodated in balance with the preservation of the natural environment and scarce resources and the unique local character of individual communities."

On January 24, 2005, the VCCPG culminated a multi-year collaborative effort with County Planners and unanimously endorsed maximum density of 14.9 du/acre in the Village core areas of Valley Center.

The August 2006 GP2020 Map limits Village Densities in Valley Center to 14.9 du/acre.

**Action:** The VCCPG reaffirms support for maximum density as specified supported by Goal LU-1.A, VCCPG and County planning efforts that limit maximum density to 14.9 du/acre. LU-1.22 should not be interpreted to increase residential densities above 14.9 du/acre.

2. **Equity:** On January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2005 the VCCPG unanimously endorsed including an equity mechanism as a needed part of any GP process.

**Action:** The VCCPG reaffirms its previous recommendation (1-24-05) that the BOS adopt an appropriate

equity mechanism as part of the updated GPU.

3. **Community Plan:** In recent discussion, county officials have indicated Community Plans may not be incorporated into the GPU. If Community Plans are not a part of the legal planning documents, communities may not have adequate protection and/or enforcement mechanisms to protect and enhance community character.

**Action:** The VCCPG recommends the BOS add appropriate Goals and Policies that incorporate Community Plans into the GPU. The VCCPG also advises County officials the PG will not support any GPU that does not provide adequate enforcement and protection provisions for Community Plans.

4. **Town Center Planning:** Various county documents extol the value of Smart Growth as the guiding principle for future development in San Diego County. Smart Growth principles, however, create higher residential density, commercial activity, and industrial impact into compact Village areas and Town Cores. Because there is greater impact in smaller areas, greater planning efforts must be dedicated to Village and Town Center planning. San Diego County is dedicated to Smart Growth, but it has not dedicated adequate planning resources required to properly implement Smart Growth principles in Village and Town Centers.

**Action:** The VCCPG recommends, again, county officials (BOS, Directors, Department Heads, etc.) focus their efforts on Town Center Planning as a part of the GPU for Valley Center and other similarly impacted communities in San Diego County. The County should also aggressively Smart Growth Incentive Funding.

5. **Preamble:** Introductory material and Land Use Framework discussion contains content that should be reflected in Goals and Policies.

**Action:** The VCCPG recommends translating all critical points within the introductory material and Land Use Framework into the appropriate goals and policies.

6. **Semi-Rural and Rural Designations:** There is significant differences between rural and semi-rural land uses as specified in the Land Use document, but there are not separate Goals and Policies for those two distinct types of land-use.

**Action:** The VCCPG recommends developing separate Goals and Policies for Semi-Rural and Rural land-use designations as described in the Land-Use Framework.

7. **GPA's:** Many GPA's incrementally undermine Community Plans and GPAs that are processed during GPU processes can be out of step with existing and/or new GP.

**Recommendation:** The VCCPG recommends imposing moratorium of GPAs until County adopts the GPU.

8. **Regional Category** changes should only be considered within normal GPU process

**Action:** The VCCPG recommends elimination of regional category changes except when considered as a part of a comprehensive GPU process.

9. **Water Resource Management:** Ground water and natural water resources should be differentiated from public utilities within the GPU and DPLU should consider availability of water resources as a part of the Land-Use element. For these reasons, the GPU should include Goals and Policies that address all pertinent water resource issues within the Land-Use Element.

**Action:** The VCCPG recommends DPLU develop appropriate water resource management Goals and Policies for the Land Use Element.

10. **Affordable Housing Density Bonus:** Under current state law, developers receive a 35% affordable housing density bonus that is awarded on top of GP densities.

**Action:** Recommend preferred placement of affordable housing to be defined in the Valley Center Community Plan.

11. **Protection of Community Character:** Goals and Policies are not strong enough to protect existing rural lands, old trees, special features, and cultural resources unique in Valley Center.

**Action:** The VCCPG recommends DPLU staff develop specific Goals and Policies that include measures to protect unique rural lands, natural, historical and cultural resources in all land use categories.

12. **Commercial Land Use in Village Areas:** There is too much C-1 land use in the Planning Area and the Northern Village needs to have Mixed Use in order to have a "Town Core" eligible for Smart Growth Incentive Funding.

**Motion:** The VCCPG recommends reducing total amount of C-1 in the Northern Village and adding additional C-3 (or appropriate Village Core/Mixed Use designation).

13. **Wild Fire Corridors:** Provisions for wildfire protection should be included in the GPU similar to LU-1.10 concerning floodplains.

**Action:** The VCCPG recommends County officials identify wildfire corridors and require special building standards within those corridors.

14. **Village Limit Line:** Current description of Village Limit Line is too vague and it may not adequately constrain urban services within Village areas.

**Action:** The VCCPG recommends using the BOS 2003 definition of Village Limit Lines, which reads, in part:

"The purpose of the Village Limit Line...is to identify land to which development should be directed with the GP2020 planning period. The Village Limit Line surrounds land categorized as Village or Village Core...Community Planning areas containing only semi-rural or rural lands will not have a Village Limit Line...New development containing Village or Village Core densities shall not occur outside a Village Limit Line"

15. **Infrastructure Delays:** Under current policies, needed infrastructure improvements can occur years after associated development impacts. The current system of funding infrastructure improvements is broken. Infrastructure improvements need to happen concurrently with impacts, even if government bodies need to provide initial financing for those projects.

**Action:** The Valley Center Planning Group recommends county officials work with involved governmental agencies and modify Policy LU-1.6 to state financing of needed infrastructure must be completed "concurrently" with associated impacts.

16. **Passive Verbs and Indefinite Language:** The Land-Use document is filled with passive verbs, which limit its power and value.

**Action:** The VCCPG recommends replacing passive verbs with active mandates that will better enforce GP intent.

17. **Community Character:** Not enough Goals and Policies support and protect community character, particularly in the village areas where there will be high intensity commercial development.

**Action:** The VCCPG recommends DPLU develop appropriate Goals and Policies to ensure commercial development (especially large chain stores and franchises) adhere to Community Plans and Design Standards.

18. **Light of the Valley Lutheran Church:** For many years, members of Light of the Valley Lutheran Church have been seeking to connect to the Sewer expansion in the Southern Village.

**Action:** The VCCPG approves the request from Light of the Valley Lutheran Church to include the subject parcel within the Village Limit Line.

19. **Southern Village Limit Line:** VCCPG should reaffirm its position regarding the position of the Northern and Southern Village Limit Lines.

**Action:** The VCCPG endorses the August 2005 Northern and Southern Village Limit Lines.

VanKoughnett: Has concerns about Items 14 and 15. The lines should be general lines vs. a strict wall. Seems like this would thwart density that might be appropriate. Item 15 – Thinks that this is unrealistic.

Smith: This might be something that the PG could OK.

Coulombe: This PG has no control over that. We need to make a stand on this.

Glavinic: Equity is very important for GPU. Right now GPU without an equity mechanism is a 'land grab' or stealing from some and giving to others. Smart growth with limit lines is very important and will allow new communities with green belts.

**Motion 1:** see above

SCHWARTZ	SIMPSON		COULOMBE	WASHBURN	ROBERTSON	SMITH	MONTROSS	K. SIMPSON			LAYNE	HOFER	VANKOUGHNETT	SHOEMAKER
Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	N	Y

Maker/Second: K. Simpson/ Hofer

Carries (Y-N-A): 11 – 1 - 0

Notes:

**Motion 2:** All actions other than Item 18.

SCHWARTZ	SIMPSON		COULOMBE	WASHBURN	ROBERTSON	SMITH	MONTROSS	K. SIMPSON			LAYNE	HOFER	VANKOUGHNETT	SHOEMAKER
N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	N	N

Maker/Second: Washburn/ Hofer

Carries (Y-N-A): 9 – 3 - 0

Notes:

**Motion 3:** The VCCPG approves the request from Light of the Valley Lutheran Church to include the subject parcel within the Southern Village Limit Line.

Discussion: Coulombe – This correlates with new building and growth.

Schwartz – Two other people tried to get included in the sewer and were denied. Why say yes to them and no to the others.

VanKoughnett – This is a member of the community. I think this was a mistake and was overlooked the first time when the limit line was first drawn.

K. Simpson – This is a difficult one. I voted no the first time but then voted yes at the SC. They are a quasi-public facility and can benefit the community.

Layne – the intent of the PG is to maintain and benefit the community through planning. This does not mean that we have to say yes to everything else. It does not need to be precedent setting.

Schwartz / Coulombe – If we do it for the church, then we need to do it for everyone.

Jon Buerfeind, representing the church – Has been before the PG, VCMWD, and DPLU. This Church has been here for 17 years. We now want to expand and to do this we need sewer. We would like your support to extend a line so that the Southern Village can have a Church. A Village should have a Church.

Smith – This is precedent setting no matter what we do. However, this is not a commercial project but a public enterprise.

SCHWARTZ	S. SIMPSON		COULOMBE	WASHBURN	ROBERTSON	SMITH	MONTROSS	K. SIMPSON			LAYNE	HOFER	VANKOUGHNETT	SHOEMAKER
N	Y		N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N	Y	Y

Maker/Second: K.Simpson/Robertson

Carries (Y-N-A): 8 – 4 – 0

Notes:

g)

Valley View Casino Hotel Project – discussion and possible vote on concerns for March 13, 2008 deadline for Public input.

#### Discussion & Comments:

Robertson – The building a monolith. The building is 200 feet above Lake Wohlford Road.

K. Simpson – Please word something about the VC Design Guidelines.

Stewart Earlwan – This design is fine. There is nothing wrong with this building.

Tribe – 1. We need to operate a casino that is profitable. However, we want to be good neighbors.

The meeting is Thurs., March 13, 2008 at 6:00 pm. at the Valley View Casino Event Center.

**Motion:** Move that the PG approve the concerns and submit then as presented by Oliver Smith

SCHWARTZ	S. SIMPSON		COULOMBE	WASHBURN	ROBERTSON	SMITH	MONTROSS	K. SIMPSON	MONGOMERY	HUNTINGTON	LAYNE	HOFER	VANKOUGHNETT	SHOEMAKER

Maker/Second: Layne/Hofer

Carries (Y-N-A):

Notes: not voted upon – to continue

#### 5. Approval of Minutes:

**Motion:** The PG approves the February 13, 2008 minutes as disseminated.

Maker/Second:

Carries (Y-N-A): - 0 – 0

Notes:

#### 6. Land Use Items:

**6.a.** Vacation 2007-0172 (N. Layne), Department of General Services request to vacate parcels dedicated for future street use adjacent to Banbury Drive.

**Discussion & Comments:** continued

**6.b.** S07-047, (S. Simpson) Possible Lot Split Gordon Hill.

**Discussion & Comments:** continued

6.c.	TPM 21103, (Montross) 11.6 acres into 2 parcels. 29945 Spearhead Trail Owner: McBride.	
Discussion & Comments: continued		
6.d.	TPM 21086, (Montross) 4.44 acres into 2 parcels. Via Salvador, owner Benesh.	
Discussion & Comments: continued		
7.	Announcements & Items of Interest to the VCCPG:	
a)	Reimbursement for VCCPG mailbox rent to S. Simpson	
b)	Seat Vacancy #10 – vote on candidates	
c)	Seat vacancy #11 – present candidates	
8.	Subcommittee Reports & Business:	
d)	Brook Forest – open, Chair.	
e)	Circulation – John Coulombe, Chair.	
f)	GP Update – Andy Washburn, Chair. K. Simpson/Hofler moved to remove Carol Prime and add Ann Quinley and make K. Simpson Chair. Vote: 12 – 0 – 0	
g)	Nominations – Leon Schwartz, Chair.	
h)	Orchard Run – Deb Hofler, Chair.	
i)	Paradise Mountain – open, Chair.	
j)	Rancho Lilac – Frank Shoemaker, Chair.	
k)	Rules Revision – Keith Simpson, Chair.	
l)	Northern Village – Deb Hofler, Chair.	
m)	Strategic Planning—Keith Simpson, Chair.	
n)	Southern Node —Terry Van Koughnett, Chair.	
o)	Tribal Liaison – Terry Van Koughnett, Chair.	
p)	Valley Center Church – Terry Van Koughnett, Chair.	
q)	Website – Terry Van Koughnett, Chair.	
9.	Correspondence Received:	
a.	Clerk of the BOS to distribution, BOS meeting agenda for February 26 & 27, 2008	
b.	P.O. Box Fees Due Bill February 2, 2008	
c.	Valley View Project Environmental Evaluation.	
d.	TM 5087RA / SPA 08-001 (sent to Fallbrook)	
10.	Requests for Items on Upcoming Agendas:	
a)		
11.	Motion to extend the meeting 10 minutes:	
	Maker/Second: K. Simpson/Smith	Vote: 12 – 0 - 0
Notes: meeting ended by default at 10:10 p.m.		